

REMARKS

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 12, 20, 23, 29, and 38 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in at least paragraphs 0011 and 0012 of the application. Claims 5, 7, 14, 34, and 39 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 13 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §101

The Office has objected to claims 29-33, 35-37, and 45, at page 2 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants have amended claim 29 to recite a “computing device” to clarify that the claim is not directed to software per se. Hence, claim 29 is allowable. Claims 30-33, 35-37, and 45 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 30-33, 35-37, and 45 are allowable.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 12, 21-22, 38, and 40-44 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 1-2, 4, 6, 12-13, 21-22, 38, and 40-44, at page 2 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,619,555 (“Fenton”). Claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering its rejection moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 12, and 21-22

For a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. The cited portions of Fenton fail to teach every element of claim 1. For example, the cited portions of Fenton fail to teach initiating presentation of a host *GUI including advanced call controls to the caller* when the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1. In Fenton, “[a]n audio conferencing system is provided whereby an audio conference participant interfaces with the system through a graphical user interface (GUI) computer program running on a remote

computer or workstation.” See Fenton, Abstract. Fenton discloses that “[b]y providing a GUI-based software interface to the audio conferencing system, significantly greater functionality is conveniently provided to an audio conference participant than previously available.” See Fenton, Abstract. Fenton further discloses that “[a]n authorized participant is either the conference organizer or any invited conference participant”. Fenton, col. 8, lines 25-27. Thus, Fenton fails to disclose a host GUI including advanced call controls that is different than a participant GUI because, in Fenton, the same GUI is provided to both the conference organizer and any invited conference participant. Therefore, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose initiating presentation of a host GUI including advanced call controls to the caller when the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the call participants, as in claim 1. Therefore claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 12, and 21-22 depend from claim 1, which applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claims 2, 4, 6, 12, and 21-22 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

In addition, the dependent claims disclose additional elements not disclosed by the cited portions of Fenton. For example, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose that the status of each call participant is selected from a group consisting of an on-call state, an off-call state, a currently speaking state, a waiting to speak state, and a paused-call state, as in claim 6. In addition, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose updating the GUI element to indicate a desire of a first call participant to communicate with at least a second call participant via the collaborative call, as in claim 12. For these additional reasons, claims 6 and 12 are allowable.

Claims 38 and 40

The cited portions of Fenton fail to teach every element of claim 38. For example, the cited portions of Fenton fail to teach presenting a host graphical user interface (GUI) element automatically by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining a collaborative call comprising call participants, *after the caller has been identified as a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants*, the host GUI element operable to display a listing of the call participants, the listing including a participant status associated with

each of the call participants, wherein *the host GUI element includes advanced call controls*, as in claim 38. In Fenton, “[a]n audio conferencing system is provided whereby an audio conference participant interfaces with the system through a graphical user interface (GUI) computer program running on a remote computer or workstation.” Fenton, Abstract. Fenton further discloses that “[a]n authorized participant is either the conference organizer or any invited conference participant”. Fenton, col. 8, lines 25-27. Thus, Fenton fails to disclose a host GUI having administrative rights not available to other call participants because, in Fenton, the same GUI is provided to both the conference organizer and any invited conference participant. Therefore, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose “presenting a host graphical user interface (GUI) element automatically by a presentation engine to a device associated with a caller joining a collaborative call comprising call participants, after the caller has been identified as a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants, the host GUI element operable to display a listing of the call participants, the listing including a participant status associated with each of the call participants, wherein the host GUI element includes advanced call controls,” as in claim 38. Therefore claim 38 is allowable.

Claim 40 depends from claim 38, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Therefore, claim 40 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 38.

Claims 20, 23-24, 26, 29, 32-33, and 45 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 20, 23-24, 26, 29, 32-33, and 45, at page 9 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fenton. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 20

Claim 20 depends from claim 1. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose initiating presentation of a host GUI including advanced call controls to the caller when the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1. Thus, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose at least one element of claim 20. Therefore claim 20 is allowable.

In addition, claim 20 discloses additional elements not disclosed by the cited portions of Fenton. For example, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose determining that the caller is the call host by authenticating credentials received from the caller, as in claim 20. For this additional reason, claim 20 is allowable.

Claims 23-24 and 26

The cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose or suggest to initiate presentation of a host graphical user interface (GUI) in connection with a collaborative call, the host GUI comprising an administrator icon and a listing of call participants associated with the collaborative call, *the host GUI providing advanced call controls not available to other call participants*, as in claim 23. As previously discussed, in Fenton, the same GUI is provided to both the conference organizer and any invited conference participant. Thus, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose at least one element of claim 23. Hence, claim 23 is allowable.

Claims 24 and 26 depend from claim 23, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 24 and 26 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 23. In addition, the dependent claims disclose additional elements not disclosed by the cited portions of Fenton. For example, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose that the status of each call participant is selected from a group consisting of an on-call state, an off-call state, a currently speaking state, a waiting to speak state, and a paused-call state, as in claim 26. For this additional reason, claim 26 is allowable.

Claims 29, 32-33, and 45

The cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose or suggest a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein *the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI*, as in claim 29. As previously discussed, in Fenton, the same GUI is provided to both the conference organizer and any invited conference participant. Thus,

the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose at least one element of claim 29. For this additional reason, claim 29 is allowable.

Claims 32-33 and 45 depend from claim 29, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 32-33 and 45 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable claim.

In addition, the dependent claims disclose additional elements not disclosed by the cited portions of Fenton. For example, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose an update engine associated with the presentation engine; the update operable to initiate an updating of the first GUI and the second GUI in response to a change in the status of a particular participant, as in claim 32. In addition, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose that the presentation engine is operable to display an image or a portion of a document on the first GUI or the second GUI during the collaborative call, as in claim 45. For these additional reasons, claims 32 and 45 are allowable.

Claims 3 and 35 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 3 and 35, at page 15 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fenton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,465 ("Pickett"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 3

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose initiating presentation of a host GUI including advanced call controls to the caller when the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1. The cited portions of Pickett fail to cure this deficiency. Instead, the cited portions of Pickett disclose that "systems and methods are provided for multiple native mode/protocol voice and data transmissions and receptions with a computing system having a multi-bus structure, including, for example, a TDM bus and a packet bus, and multi-protocol framing engines." Pickett, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Pickett fail to disclose initiating presentation of *a host GUI including advanced call controls* to the caller when

the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 1 is allowable. Hence, claim 3 is allowable, at least by virtue of depending from an allowable claim.

Claim 35

Claim 35 depends from claim 29. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI, as in claim 29. The cited portions of Pickett fails to cure this deficiency. The cited portions of Pickett disclose “systems and methods [that] are provided for multiple native mode/protocol voice and data transmissions and receptions with a computing system having a multi-bus structure, including, for example, a TDM bus and a packet bus, and multi-protocol framing engines.” Pickett, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Pickett fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate *presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI)* on the remote host station associated with a *host having administrative rights not available to other call participants*, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI, as in claim 29 (emphasis added). Therefore claim 29 is allowable. Hence, claim 35 is allowable, at least by virtue of depending from an allowable claim.

Claims 8, 12, 15, and 37 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 8, 12-13, 15, and 37, at page 17 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fenton in view of U.S. Application No. 2004/0047461 (“Weisman”). Claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering its rejection moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the remaining rejections.

Claims 8, 12, and 15

Claims 8, 12, and 15 depend from claim 1. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose initiating presentation of a host GUI including advanced call controls to the caller when the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1. The cited portions of Weisman fail to cure this deficiency. In Weisman a “method and apparatus are disclosed to allow individuals to initiate, join, manage, and participant in a conference call.” Weisman, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Weisman fail to disclose initiating *presentation of a host GUI including advanced call controls* to the caller when the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable. Hence, claims 8, 12, and 15 are allowable, at least by virtue of depending from an allowable claim.

In addition, the dependent claims disclose additional elements not disclosed by the cited portions of Weisman. For example, the cited portions of Weisman fail to disclose updating the GUI element to indicate a desire of a first call participant to communicate with at least a second call participant via the collaborative call, as in claim 12. For this reason, claim 12 is allowable.

Claim 37

Claim 37 depends from claim 29. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a *first graphical user interface (GUI)* on the remote host station associated with *a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants*, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein *the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI*, as in claim 29. Weisman fails to cure this deficiency. Weisman discloses a “method and apparatus are disclosed to allow individuals to initiate, join, manage, and participant in a conference call.” Weisman, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Weisman fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate

presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI, as in claim 29. Therefore claim 29 is allowable. Hence, claim 37 is allowable, at least by virtue of depending from an allowable claim.

In addition, the cited portions of Fenton and Weisman, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a next to speak engine associated with the presentation engine, the next to speak engine operable to recognize a desire of one of the participants to communicate via the collaborative call and to initiate presentation of an indication of the desire in the first GUI, as in claim 37. For this additional reason, claim 37 is allowable.

Claims 9, 16-19, 25, 27-28, and 31 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 9, 16-19, 25, 27-28, and 31, at page 21 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fenton in view of U.S. Application No. 2003/0169291 ("Nakata"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 9 and 16-19

Claims 9 and 16-19 depend from claim 1. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose initiating presentation of a host GUI including advanced call controls to the caller when the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1. Nakata fails to cure this deficiency. Nakata discloses "a desktop conference method and a desktop conference system for performance of semiconductor device process or a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus utilizing a communication system in a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus business." Nakata, paragraph 0001. However, the cited portions of Nakata fail to disclose *initiating presentation of a host GUI including advanced call controls to the caller when the caller is the call host*, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1 (emphasis added). Therefore, claim 1 is allowable. Hence, claims 9 and 16-19 are allowable, at least by virtue of depending from an allowable claim.

Claims 25 and 27-28

Claims 25 and 27-28 depend from claim 23. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose or suggest to initiate presentation of a host graphical user interface (GUI) in connection with a collaborative call, the host GUI comprising an administrator icon and a listing of call participants associated with the collaborative call, the host GUI providing advanced call controls not available to other call participants, as in claim 23. Nakata fails to cure this deficiency. Nakata discloses “a desktop conference method and a desktop conference system for performance of semiconductor device process or a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus utilizing a communication system in a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus business.” Nakata, paragraph 0001. However, the cited portions of Nakata fail to disclose to initiate *presentation of a host graphical user interface (GUI)* in connection with a collaborative call, the host GUI comprising an administrator icon and a listing of call participants associated with the collaborative call, *the host GUI providing advanced call controls not available to other call participants*, as in claim 23. Hence, claim 23 is allowable. Claims 25 and 27-28 depend from claim 23, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. Accordingly, claims 25 and 27-28 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable claim.

Claim 31

Claim 31 depends from claim 29. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with *a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants*, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI, as in claim 29 (emphasis added). Nakata fails to cure this deficiency. Therefore, claim 29 is allowable. Hence, claim 31 is allowable, at least by virtue of depending from an allowable claim.

Claims 10-11 are Allowable

The Office has rejected claims 10-11, at page 26 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fenton in view of Nakata and further in view of Weisman. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 10-11 depend from claim 1. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose initiating presentation of a host GUI including advanced call controls to the caller when the caller is the call host, the host GUI different than a participant GUI presented to the other call participants, as in claim 1. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Nakata and Weisman fail to cure this deficiency. Therefore claim 1 is allowable. Hence, claims 10-11 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable claim.

Claim 30 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 30, at page 28 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fenton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,192,118 ("Bayless"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 30 depends from claim 29. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with *a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants*, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI, as in claim 29. Bayless fails to cure this deficiency. Bayless discloses a "server computer system [that] provides telephony services, database services and access to E-mail, voice mail, video conferencing and facsimile systems." Bayless, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Bayless fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with *a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants*, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station

associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI, as in claim 29. Therefore, claim 29 is allowable. Hence, claim 30 is allowable, at least by virtue of depending from an allowable claim.

Claim 36 is Allowable

The Office has rejected claim 36, at page 28 of the Office Action, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Fenton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,235 (“Goldman”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 36 depends from claim 29. As previously discussed, the cited portions of Fenton fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with *a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants*, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein *the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI*, as in claim 29 (emphasis added). Goldman fails to cure this deficiency. Goldman discloses a “system and method for bridging the POTS network and a packet network, such as the Internet, uses a set of access objects that provide the interfacing and functionality for exchanging address and payload information with the packet network, and for exchanging payload information with the payload subnetwork and signaling information with the signaling subnetwork of the POTS network.” Goldman, Abstract. However, the cited portions of Goldman fail to disclose a presentation engine associated with the participant status engine, the presentation engine operable to initiate presentation of a first graphical user interface (GUI) on the remote host station associated with a host having administrative rights not available to other call participants, after the host is identified, and a second GUI on the remote participant station associated with a caller, after the caller joining the collaborative call is identified, wherein the first GUI presenting advanced call controls that are not presented by the first GUI, as in claim 29. Therefore, claim 29 is allowable. Hence, claim 36 is allowable, at least by virtue of depending from an allowable claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the cited portions of the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.


Any changes to the claims in this response, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the cited art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

10-21-2008
Date

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicants
TOLER LAW GROUP, IP
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)